



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## FEWTER.

THIS word is tolerably common in the romances of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. It signifies some kind of support for a spear, which was brought into use only when the knight was about to charge, serving to steady his aim, and perhaps add force to the thrust.

To him rides with his spere on fewter festened. *W. of Pal.* 3593.

A spere in fewter he foldes. *Av. Art.* xlii, 7.

A fair spere in fewtyre he castes. *M. Art.* 1366.

In fewtir thai kest scharpe speris. *Wallace*, iv, 447.

In the rowme of ane renk in fewtir kest he. *Rauf Coil-sear*, 809.

I have met with the English word nowhere but in the old romances (in which I include the *Wallace*). Chaucer does not use it, using *arest* instead (*R. R.* 7561; *K. T.* 1744).

In Old French it is common. See *Orson de Beauvais*, 3511; *Ordre de Chevalerie*, 7204; *Chev. d. l. Charette*; *Rom. de Renart* x, 734; Froissart, *Dit dou Florin*, 137.

Du Cange (s. v. *feltrum*) cites *lances sus fautres*, *Guiart* (A. D. 1214) and one or two other romances, and *fautre* or *feltre* seems to be the old French form. If the etymology from *feltrum* (and not from *fulcrum*) be correct, it must have been a felt-lined socket, and the change from that term to *arest* or *rest* would seem to imply a change in the article itself.

Now we know pretty well, from contemporary drawings, the shape and mode of holding the lance. In the twelfth century it seems to have had a plain smooth shaft; but in the thirteenth we find the shaft swelling out above the gripe, so as to give a firmer hold. In the fifteenth we find the *vamplate*, a flaring disk of metal, fastened on the shaft just above the gripe. The lance was held under the arm, and gripped with the hand close to the body, the butt standing out clear behind. Now when the vamplate was used, it was brought against the knight's cuirass; but before its use, some contrivance was necessary to confirm the lance, as the mere gripe of hand and arm could not withstand the impact of the charge. Hence the *fewter*, and then the *arest* or *rest*.

The *arest* was a metallic projection from the right side of the breast-plate (as we may see in Meyrick's *Antient Armour*) which supported

the lance in some way. The *fewter*, if a socket, must have received the butt of the lance, and the question is, how was it attached, and where? The *Oxford Dictionary* defines it, "the rest or support for a lance . . . attached to the saddle of a knight." That it could have been attached solidly to the saddle seems impossible, for the illustrations show the lance held well above the saddle, and the butt standing out free behind. It might possibly have been attached to the saddle or the cuirass by a chain or thong, and slipped over the butt before charging. Meyrick gives no help, for he supposes (in Glossary) the *fautre* to have been some kind of "armour for the thighs," a notion which his very citations show to be absurd. Godefroy (s. v. *fautre*) defines it: "arrêt fixé au plastron de fer pour recevoir le bois de la lance;" and I incline to this definition.

I have written this probably too long note, in the hope that it may catch the eye of some one who can explain exactly what the *fewter* was, and how it was used.

WM. HAND BROWNE.

*Johns Hopkins University.*

## DID HROTSWITHA IMITATE TERENCE?

THE generally accepted opinion about the dramatic work of Hrotswitha is well phrased by a recent writer on the beginnings of our dramatic literature. This writer speaks of Hrotswitha as

"turning the unholy leaves of Terence with one hand, while she kept the other on her beads, assimilating so much of his style and phraseology as to enable her to produce a few comedies after the external likeness of his own."

Her comedies are "plays written from an open Terence." Are these plays of Hrotswitha written after the models Terence furnished? Is there any such imitation on Hrotswitha's part as the historians of our early literature assert?

*χριστὸς πάσχων*, a Greek play of perhaps the twelfth century, professedly in imitation of Euripides, is still extant. A recent editor has made out a long list of passages and phrases which the unknown author of the play borrowed from various Greek dramatists, and

above all from Euripides. No one has thus specified the indebtedness of Hrotswitha. M. Magnin, in his learned notes on the six plays, does not call attention to a single thing in any one of them that is reminiscent of Terence. He does, however, find things that remind one of Shakespeare, and even of Voltaire. In all that has been written about Hrotswitha and her six plays, it would be difficult to find a reference to any definite trace of Terence's influence that anybody has discovered in her work.

But to turn to the plays themselves. Hrotswitha's are in prose, Terence's in verse. Not only is there no reminder of the metre of Terence in the prose of Hrotswitha, but M. Chasles pointed out what seems to be the fact that, while Hrotswitha tried to write prose, she fell now and then into the rude Germanic rimes—that were in the tenth century beginning to take the place of the earlier alliterative verse—of her own region and period.

Hrotswitha's plots and her management of them are entirely different from Terence's. Terence usually respects the unity of time, and that of course makes it necessary for the first scenes of his plays to be given up pretty largely to ancient history. Hrotswitha entirely disregards the unity of time—and the other two, for that matter—and plunges at once into the midst of things. Then, too, Terence's plots are trivial but complex; while Hrotswitha's are important but simple.

Hrotswitha's material is of an altogether different sort from that of Terence. The stories of her plays are all of them furnished by the sacred annalists of the Christian faith. They are as different from the material Terence uses as the moral atmosphere of Gandersheim was different from that of Terence's Rome.

One finds in Hrotswitha a considerable variety of personages, but none of them is one of Terence's six or eight stock types of character.

The wit of the Roman poet, his philosophic remarks about men and things, his rhetorical effects—all these Hrotswitha might have imitated. They are not difficult to copy. Humor and pathos, apt characterization and dramatic sense, all these are found in Hrotswitha. But they are things Hrotswitha could not have imitated, even if she had found them in Ter-

ence. It is impossible to copy them. Terence and Hrotswitha both wrote plays, each wrote six, and there the similarity ends.

Now is there any reason for believing that Hrotswitha thought she was imitating Terence? that she was conscious of his influence? If she had any acknowledgements to make to Terence, the natural place—indeed the inevitable place—for her to make them was in the address to her learned patrons. But there is not a word about Terence there. To God alone—the true *largitor ingenii*—she acknowledges indebtedness. In the address to the reader, however,—a sort of apology for being engaged in such profane business as play-writing—she refers to Terence, and from this reference has come no end of vague assertion about Hrotswitha being a servile copyist of that poet. Now what is this reference? She mentions—and strongly deprecates—the habit holy men have of reading Terence. She intimates that there is far less danger of imitating him in one's way of writing than in reading him. But she makes it perfectly clear that by imitating him she means using the same literary form, that is, the dramatic, and she hopes to show that a form which has been employed by Terence to set forth the degradation of woman may be useful in quite a different fashion. It is impossible to imagine how anybody could make this address to the reader mean that Hrotswitha was a disciple of Terence and that she took him for her model.

When one first reads these plays of Hrotswitha one finds it hard to believe that they are genuine. To ascribe them to some fifteenth century Chatterton is the easiest way of accounting for them. At about the date of the pretended discovery of these manuscripts there was springing up in Germany new interest in Classical literature, and the Latin dramatists especially had great vogue and exerted great influence. It is not hard to believe that some ingenious literary person might have attempted by a clever fraud to show his contemporaries a striking example of the tremendous influence of Terence at the very midnight of the dark ages, and in the most unlikely quarters. But that will not do. For there is no Terence in these plays, and there certainly would have been had they been

written for the purpose just described. Besides, the original manuscripts are still preserved, and have successfully withstood the scrutiny of scholarship for some four centuries. And, finally, one cannot imagine any reason why the learned Celtes—poet of reputation as well as scholar—who discovered the manuscripts, should have manufactured them. Had he manufactured them there would undoubtedly have been Terence enough in them.

Hrotswitha was a really great original genius, great because original. She stands alone, without ancestors and without heirs. Her work is inexplicable, but still significant, for it looks forward and not backward. It is a prophecy, which we have seen fulfilled.

ARTHUR J. ROBERTS.

Colby College.

#### ANGLO-NORMAN FRENCH.

*The Dialogues of Gregory the Great translated into Anglo-Norman French by Angier*, by TIMOTHY CLORAN. Strassburg: printed by J. H. Ed. Heitz (Heitz & Mündel), 1901. 84 pp.

THIS publication, dedicated to Professor Gröber, is preliminary to an edition of the whole Anglo-French translation of Gregory's remarkable work, of which we already have some other old translations, notably the French one published by Foerster in 1876. In its arrangement it follows pretty closely the plan followed by P. Meyer in the article in which he published the verse translation of the *Life of Gregory*, made by the same writer, and contained in the same manuscript (*Romania*, xii, 145-208). We have first a chapter on the text, containing introductory remarks on the manuscript and the author (in which Meyer's statements are summarized with a few additions), and also several extracts from the manuscript, as specimens of the work. Then comes a comparison of the translation with the Latin original (pp. 31-39), a chapter on phonology (pp. 40-53; the heading used is "phonetics," a word which I prefer to use in a different sense), one on morphology (pp. 54-63), about two pages on the order of words, followed by some remarks on metre (pp. 67-71), after which the written accents (black and

red) used in the manuscript are discussed, a specimen of the text with indication of the accents being also given (pp. 72-78). The whole ends with two word-lists (pp. 79-84), one of "mots savants," the other of the most noteworthy words and forms wanting in Godefroy. The discussion of the language, modeled as it is on Meyer's treatment, does not give a complete view of the phonology or the morphology of the text, but it makes the impression of careful observation, and adds a number of details to the linguistic features already noted by Meyer. There are several misprints, and sometimes the arrangement of, for instance, the examples is not the best possible. Such things are not surprising when we remember the inevitable difficulties which stand in the way of accurate printing in English in a foreign country. Perhaps also an occasional inelegance, or even some obscurity of language may find its explanation in these circumstances.

The following details are not all of much importance. I select them for mention, partly because in such work as this minute accuracy is desirable, though not always attainable, and partly because some of them may need attention in the complete edition of this long work (over nineteen thousand verses) which I hope may be published before long. P. 1, note 2. The statement as to the first leaf of the manuscript is presumably correct, but since it is not in accordance with Meyer's (*Rom.*, xii, 145, n. 2), it would have been well to say that this slight correction was made. P. 2. The words "in the year 1212" may be thought to be a correction of Meyer's date (1201), but it is the latter which is found in the place referred to. Pp. 4-6. After the words used on p. 4 one naturally assumes that the "supplementary details" which follow are new, but this is not correct for the theory of a revision to which the red accents are due. The matter is put correctly on p. 75. On p. 4 it is also said that *oi* (= *a* + Romance *i*), which is not infrequent in the *Dialogues*, is not found in the *Life*, but *oie* (= *habeam*) is mentioned by Meyer (*l. c.*, p. 201, §21), though not in §2 (p. 193). Only eight cases of feminine rhyme (a a a) are said (p. 5) to occur in the translation of the *Veni Creator*, but why are lines